January 2008

Linguistic Anthropology of Education

Stanton Wortham
University of Pennsylvania, stanton.wortham@bc.edu

Linguistic Anthropology of Education

Abstract

Linguistic anthropological theories and methods have enriched our understanding of education. Almost all education is mediated by language, and linguistic anthropologists use both precise linguistic analyses and powerful anthropological theories to describe how educational language use establishes important social relations. Because educational institutions influence processes of concern to anthropologists - including the production of differentially valued identities, the circulation and transformation of cultural models, and nation states' establishment of official peoples - linguistic anthropological research on education also contributes to cultural and linguistic anthropology more generally. This article defines linguistic anthropology through its focus on language form, use, ideology, and domain, and it reviews linguistic anthropological research that focuses on these four aspects of educational language use.

Comments

Linguistic Anthropology of Education

Stanton Wortham

Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104-6216; email: stantonw@gse.upenn.edu

Key Words

schooling, communicative practice, semiotics, pragmatics, language ideology

Abstract

Linguistic anthropological theories and methods have enriched our understanding of education. Almost all education is mediated by language, and linguistic anthropologists use both precise linguistic analyses and powerful anthropological theories to describe how educational language use establishes important social relations. Because educational institutions influence processes of concern to anthropologists—including the production of differentially valued identities, the circulation and transformation of cultural models, and nation states' establishment of official peoples—linguistic anthropological research on education also contributes to cultural and linguistic anthropology more generally. This article defines linguistic anthropology through its focus on language form, use, ideology, and domain, and it reviews linguistic anthropological research that focuses on these four aspects of educational language use.

INTRODUCTION

Linguistic anthropologists study how language use both presupposes and creates social relations in cultural context (Agha 2007, Duranti 1997, Silverstein 1976). Theories and methods from linguistic anthropology have been productively applied to educational processes for the past four decades (Cazden et al. 1972, Collins 1996, Gumperz 1986, Heath 1983, Worthan & Rymes 2003). This article makes two interrelated arguments about the application of linguistic anthropological theories and methods to educational phenomena. First, educational language use and linguistic anthropological concerns illuminate each other. Linguistic anthropological approaches to language use have enriched our accounts of educational processes. The reverse is also true: Educational institutions make important contributions to social, cultural, and linguistic processes that are of central concern to both linguistic and cultural anthropologists (Hall 1999, Levinson 1999), and linguistic anthropological study of educational institutions has illuminated these processes. Second, linguistic anthropological approaches are concerned with four aspects of language use in cultural context, comprising what Silverstein (1985) calls "the total linguistic fact": form, use, ideology, and domain. Successful analyses of socially and culturally situated language use must attend to all four aspects, although individual projects often emphasize one or another.

After presenting introductory sections that define "linguistic anthropology," "linguistic anthropology of education," and "the total linguistic fact," this article reviews work in the linguistic anthropology of education that focuses on form, use, ideology, and then domain. Each section describes how linguistic anthropological approaches to that aspect of language illuminate educational processes and suggests that study of educational institutions can illuminate social and cultural processes of broad interest to anthropologists. Despite having a noun phrase for a title, this article is not intended to describe an entity—a research territory over which battles can be fought and careers built. Instead it

describes a process. Linguistic anthropological and educational research are increasingly overlapping, and this overlap enriches both fields.

LINGUISTIC ANTHROPOLOGY

Linguistic anthropologists study language use as social action. Despite prevalent folk ideologies, written and spoken language do more than refer and predicate. They also constitute actions that both presuppose and create social relations in cultural context. Most important social and cultural processes are mediated in significant part by language, and systematic study of language use enriches our understanding of them.

The main historical line of linguistic anthropology runs through Boas (1911), Sapir (1921), and Whorf (1956), to Gumperz (1982), Hymes (1964), and Silverstein (1976). Linguistic anthropology is also an interdisciplinary field. It is one of the four subfields of American anthropology, but it draws on socially oriented linguistics (Jakobson 1960, Labov 1972, Levinson 1983), qualitative sociology (Goffman 1981), philosophy of language (Peirce 1955, Putnam 1975), social theory (Bourdieu 1972), and cultural anthropology (Urban 1996). Exemplary work focuses on the ethnography of communication (Gumperz & Hymes 1964), interactional sociolinguistics (Gumperz 1982), semiotic mediation (Mertz & Parmentier 1985, Hill & Irvine 1993), performance (Bauman & Briggs 1990), metapragmatic discourse (Lucy 1993, Silverstein & Urban 1996), language ideology (Schieffelin et al. 1998), and interevent semiosis (Agha & Wortham 2005). Duranti (1997), Hanks (1996), Mertz (2007), and Parmentier (1997) provide overviews of the field.

Linguistic anthropology distinguishes itself from linguistics in two ways: It focuses on language use, not language form, and it emphasizes the language user's point of view. Duranti (1997), Hymes (1972), and Silverstein (1985) describe how linguistic anthropology takes advantage of linguists' discoveries about phonology and grammar, but only to study how language users deploy linguistic resources to accomplish social action in practice. More

contemporary linguistic anthropology takes what Mertz (2007) and Rymes (2007) call a "semiotic" approach to language use, emphasizing the flexible use of language to create sometimes-unexpected relations instead of focusing on stable norms of appropriate use. Linguistic anthropologists also do ethnography, emphasizing language users' points of view and insisting that people themselves explicitly or tacitly recognize the categories that we use to describe their communicative practices (Erickson 2004).

LINGUISTIC ANTHROPOLOGY OF EDUCATION

Linguistic anthropology has made significant contributions to our understanding of educational processes because almost all education is mediated by language use. When educators and students speak and write, they signal things not only about the subject matter they are learning but also about their affiliations with social groups both inside and outside the speech event. These affiliations, some of which are created in educational events and institutions, can both influence how students learn subject matter and shape their life trajectories. Educational researchers need to understand how educational language use presupposes and transforms social relations and how educational actions are influenced by ideologies about language and social personhood. Linguistic anthropologists provide theories and methods for studying these processes, and linguistic anthropological studies have illuminated educational phenomena for decades (Cazden et al. 1972, Cook-Gumperz 1986, Wortham & Rymes 2003).

Educational institutions also play central roles in society and culture. Study of educational institutions, and the language use that mediates them, can illuminate social, cultural, and linguistic processes of interest to many anthropologists (Hall 1999, Levinson 1999). For instance, educational institutions play central roles in authorizing and circulating ideologies of language through which "educated" and "un-

educated" language use are associated with differentially valued types of people (González & Arnot-Hopffer 2003, Zentella 1997). Schooling focused on language and literature, in particular, contributes to standardization and the hierarchical ordering of languages and dialects (Lo 2004, Moore 1999, Warriner 2007). Nation states use schools to enforce their views of languages and dialects, often establishing "peoples" associated with official and vernacular languages (Hornberger 2002, Jaffe 1999, Magga & Skutnabb-Kangas 2003). Schools also house complex and sustained interactions among diverse students, and these interactions often establish characteristic, hierarchically organized identities for students (O'Connor 2001, Rex & Green 2008, Rymes 2003, Wortham 1992). Educational language use and school-based ideologies of language thus play essential roles in social processes such as the production of dominant and subordinate identities (Collins & Blot 2003, Varenne & McDermott 1998), the socialization of individuals (Howard 2007, Mertz 1996, Ochs & Schieffelin 2007, Wortham & Jackson 2008), and the formation of nation states, transnational groups, and publics that include colonizer and colonized, "native," and "immigrant" (Lempert 2006, 2007; Rampton 2005, 2006; Reyes 2002, 2005).

This review focuses on events and processes that happen in and around educational institutions, not on informal education. Out-of-school processes make essential contributions to learning, identity, and cultural production, and linguistic anthropological approaches have been productively applied to them (Heath & McLaughlin 1993, Hull & Schultz 2002, Pelissier 1991, Schieffelin & Ochs 1986, Varenne 2007). But informal education is so widespread—taking place in families, workplaces, communities, and other settings—that a short review cannot cover it all. Schools contribute significantly to the creation of important relations, and it is productive to consider how language is used in educational institutions to do this social work.

Three related traditions overlap the linguistic anthropology of education. Language

socialization research uses linguistic anthropological theories and methods to explore socialization both in and out of school (Duff & Hornberger 2007, Garrett & Baquedano-López 2002, Riley 2008, Schieffelin & Ochs 1986). Linguistic ethnography draws on American linguistic anthropology as well as applied linguistics and social theory to explore language use and language learning in contemporary Europe (Rampton 2007). Educational linguistics uses linguistic, sociological, and anthropological approaches to study language learning and language policy (Hornberger & Hult 2006, Spolsky & Hult 2008). In this article I define linguistic anthropology of education as research on educational institutions and school-related practices that employs a linguistic anthropological approach focused on form, use, ideology, and domain. Much work in language socialization, linguistic ethnography, and educational linguistics falls within this definition, and some of this research is reviewed below. Other work in these traditions follows what Rymes (2007) calls an "ethnographic" as opposed to a "semiotic" approach—focusing on stable "norms of communication," not on how linguistic "forms are deployed flexibly in interaction to create new forms of culturally relevant action" (p. 31). Because such ethnographic work does not fully explore language use—how linguistic signs come to have meaning in context, across both interactional and historical time—it does not fall within the body of work reviewed here.

THE TOTAL LINGUISTIC FACT

This article reviews linguistic anthropological work that has examined educational institutions and school-related practices organized around the four aspects of what Silverstein (1985) calls the "total linguistic fact": form, use, ideology, and domain. Linguistic anthropologists use linguists' accounts of phonological and grammatical categories, thus studying language form, but they are not primarily interested in how linguistic forms have meaning apart from contexts of use. Instead, they study how linguistic

signs come to have both referential and relational meaning as they are used in social and cultural contexts (Duranti 1997, Hymes 1964, Silverstein 1976). The meaning of any linguistic sign in use cannot be determined by decontextualized rules, whether phonological, grammatical, or cultural. No matter how robust the relevant regularities, language users often deploy signs in unexpected yet meaningful ways (Goffman 1981, Silverstein 1992). Linguistic anthropologists study how language comes to have sometimes-unexpected meanings in interaction. As important as local contexts are, however, the meaning of any linguistic sign cannot be understood without also attending to more widely circulating models of the social world. Linguistic anthropologists often construe these models as language ideologies—models of linguistic signs and the people who characteristically use them, which others employ to understand the social relations signaled through language use (Schieffelin et al. 1998, Silverstein 1979). These ideologies are not evenly distributed across social space. They have a domain—the set of people who recognize the indexical link between a type of sign and the relevant ideology (Agha 2007). Linguistic anthropologists study how linguistic signs and models of language and social relations move from event to event, across time and across social space, and how such movement contributes to historical change.

This article uses the four aspects of form, use, ideology, and domain as an organizing principle to explore linguistic anthropological work that has enriched our understanding of educational phenomena and to show how linguistic anthropological work on education can illuminate processes of broad concern to anthropologists. In practice the four aspects cannot be separated—all language use involves linguistic forms, in use, as construed by ideologies, located within the historical movement of forms and ideologies across events. Any adequate analysis takes into account all four aspects, and ignoring or overemphasizing any one aspect can distort our understanding of how language comes to have meaning in practice.

But many analyses focus on one or two aspects without losing sight of the others.

FORM

A linguistic sign receives part of its meaning from the systematic distribution of the sign with respect to other signs. Linguists describe these distributional patterns in terms of phonological regularities and grammatical categories. "Form" refers to this fraction of meaning, which applies independent of context. Systematic attention to linguistic form has helped linguistic anthropologists illuminate various educational phenomena.

Eckert (2000) presents both an ethnographic and a quantitative sociolinguistic study of students in one suburban high school. Her statistical analyses show how gender and socioeconomic class correlate with the use of phonological variants. By tracing the intersection between gender- and class-based variants and students' peer groups, she explains how systematic differences in phonology help construct the school version of a middle-class/working-class split—the "jock"/"burnout" distinction—as well as gendered models of personhood that involve "sluttiness," aggressive masculinity, and other features. Eckert also shows how individual students use these phonological regularities in practice to navigate relationships and construct identities, and she connects her account to broader analyses of phonological changes taking place across the United States (Labov et al. 2006).

Mendoza-Denton (2007) describes the complex multimodal signs that Latina youth gang members use to distinguish themselves from mainstream peers. She attends to systematic variation in linguistic form, together with other modalities such as paralinguistic features, dress, tattoos, and bodily presentation, as she describes youth positioning themselves both within and against the larger society. Alim (2004) describes style shifting done by black youth as they adjust phonological variants, grammatical categories, and discourse markers according to their interlocutors' social po-

sitions. He explores how black youth use such forms to navigate prevalent models of race and changing socioeconomic conditions in gentrifying areas.

Eckert, Mendoza-Denton, and Alim extend Labov's (1972) variationist sociolinguistics, embedding systematic study of phonological regularities and grammatical categories within ethnographies and exploring the creative positioning that youth do through language and other sign systems. They show how secondary school youth play important roles in linguistic innovation and how language use in and around schools plays an important role in group identification and social stratification. Systematic investigation of linguistic variation and innovation can help anthropologists study the development of youth culture and the production of racialized, gendered, and class-based identities that organize both school-based and broader social relations.

Viechnicki & Kuipers (2006, Viechnicki 2008) describe grammatical and discursive resources through which middle-school students and their teachers objectify experience as scientific fact. The process of transforming experience into evidence is complex, as scientists and science students turn ordinary events into warrants for decontextualizable entities and authoritative laws. Viechnicki & Kuipers describe how science teachers and students use tense and aspect shifts, syntactic parallelism, and nominalization to remove experiences from their immediate circumstances and recontextualize them in an epistemologically authoritative scientific framework, moving from concrete experiences to universal, experience-distant formulations. Their analyses both illuminate science education and describe an important process through which authoritative knowledge is produced in modern societies (Bazerman 1999, Halliday 2004).

USE

Phonological and grammatical regularities are crucial tools for linguistic anthropological analyses, but rules of grammatically correct (or

culturally appropriate) usage do not suffice to explain how people use language to create meaningful action in practice. Analyses of language use often err by using as their key tools decontextualized grammatical, pragmatic, or cultural patterns, disregarding how linguistic signs come to have sometimes-unexpected meanings in particular contexts. Silverstein (1992; Silverstein & Urban 1996) provides a systematic account of how signs presuppose and create social relations in context. "Context" is indefinitely large, and language use only makes sense as participants and analysts identify relevant context. They rely on two processes that Silverstein calls "contextualization"—through which signs come to have meaning as they index relevant aspects of the context—and "entextualization"—through which segments of interaction emerge and cohere as recognizable events. Cultural knowledge is crucial to interpreting language use, but we can interpret linguistic signs only by examining how utterances are contextualized in practice.

Erickson & Schultz (1982) study the "organized improvization" that occurs in conversations between academic counselors and students from nonmainstream backgrounds. Erickson & Shultz do not argue simply that nonmainstream students and mainstream counselors experience a mismatch of styles, resulting in counselors' misjudgments about students. They show how counselors and students use various resources to create, override, resist, and defuse such mismatches. Nonmainstream students are often disadvantaged by their nonstandard habits of speaking and by mainstream counselors' assumptions about what they sometimes construe as deficits, but such disadvantage does not happen simply through a clash of monolithic styles. Erickson and Shultz find that "situationally emergent identity" explains more about the outcome of a gatekeeping encounter than does demographically fixed identity, and they analyze how speakers use social and cultural resources both to reproduce and to overcome disadvantage. Such work goes beyond simple reproductionist accounts to illuminate the more complex improvizations through

which educational institutions both create and restrict social mobility (Erickson 2004).

Rampton (2005) focuses on the hybrid, emergent identities created as students navigate social relations. He describes language "crossing" in urban, multiethnic groups of adolescents in the United Kingdom, as white, South Asian, and Caribbean youth mix features of Panjabi, Caribbean Creole, and Stylized Asian English. Crossing involves sprinkling words or linguistic features from other languages into speech that takes place in a predominant language. Rampton does not argue simply that minority languages are devalued and used to stigmatize nonmainstream youth nor that such youth use their home languages to resist such discrimination. Both of these processes do occur, but Rampton studies how these and other social effects are achieved in practice. Crossing is a discursive strategy in which diverse youth contest and create relations around race, ethnicity, and youth culture. The uses of minority languages involve contestation, teasing, resistance, irony, and other stances with respect to the social issues surrounding minority identities in Britain. Like Erickson (2004, Erickson & Schultz 1982), Rampton (2005, 2006) wants to understand and mitigate the disadvantages faced by minority youth, and he describes the larger social and political forces regimenting language and identity in the United Kingdom. But he does not reduce disadvantage to predictable patterns in which signs of identity routinely signal negative stereotypes. He shows instead how youth use language to navigate among the conflicting forms of solidarity and resistance available to them in multiethnic Britain.

Much other work in the linguistic anthropology of education attends closely to creativity and indeterminacy in language use (Duff 2002, 2003; He 2003; Kamberelis 2001; Kumpulainen & Mutanen 1999; Leander 2002; McDermott & Varenne 1995; Rymes 2001; Sawyer 2004; Wortham 2003, 2006). He (2003), for instance, shows how Chinese heritage language teachers often use three-part "moralized directives" to control disruptive behavior, but she also analyzes how teachers and

students sometimes transform these directives as they construct particular stances in context. Rymes (2001) describes typical "dropping out" and "dropping in" autobiographical stories through which academically marginal students construct senses of self and reject or embrace formal education, but she also shows how these "at-risk" students reproduce, contest, ridicule and otherwise rework typical stories. All this work shows that, to study the social relations established through educational language use, we must attend to the sometimes-unexpected ways that educators and students position themselves with respect to both established and emerging models of identity. Because educational institutions are important sites for the reproduction and transformation of social identities, this linguistic anthropological work on creative educational language use addresses broader anthropological concerns about how both established and unexpected social regularities emerge in practice (Bourdieu 1972, Holland & Lave 2001).

IDEOLOGY

Two types of cultural and linguistic knowledge work together to produce meaningful language use in practice. Participants and analysts must know what linguistic and paralinguistic signs index, and they must be familiar with types of events and the types of people who characteristically participate in them (Gumperz 1982; Silverstein 1992, 2003; Silverstein & Urban 1996). All work on language in use attends, explicitly or tacitly, to the second type of knowledge—to more widely distributed social and cultural patterns that form the background against which both routine and innovative usage occurs. Language users rely on models that link types of linguistic forms with the types of people who stereotypically use them, even when the model is deployed in unexpected ways or transformed in practice. Silverstein (1979) describes these models of typical language use as "linguistic ideologies," although they have also been called "language ideologies" (Schieffelin et al. 1998) and "metapragmatic" (Silverstein 1976),

"metadiscursive" (Urban 1996), "metacultural" (Urban 2001), or "metasemiotic" (Agha 2007) models. Any adequate account of language use must include language ideologies and describe how they become salient in practice.

Language ideologies systematically associate types of language use with socially located types of people, and the concept allows linguistic anthropologists to explore relations between the emergent meanings of signs in use and more enduring social structures. Language ideology has been an important topic for the linguistic anthropology of education because schools are important sites for establishing associations between "educated" and "uneducated," "sophisticated" and "unsophisticated," "official" and "vernacular" language use and types of students. Language ideologies thus help explain how schools move students toward diverse social locations, and linguistic anthropological work on these processes helps show how social individuals are produced.

Jaffe (1999) uses the concept of language ideology to trace the policies and practices involved in the recent revitalization of Corsican. She describes one essentialist ideology that values French as the language of logic and civilization and another essentialist ideology that values Corsican as the language of nationalism and ethnic pride, as well as a less essentialist ideology that embraces the use of multiple languages and multiple identities. Her analyses show how schools are a central site of struggle among these ideologies—with some trying to maintain the centrality of French in the curriculum, some favoring Corsican language revitalization, and others wanting some Corsican in the schools but resisting a new standard Corsican as the language of schooling. Jaffe explores both predictable sociohistorical patterns, such as the struggle of a colonized people to value their own language, and less familiar ones such as the celebration of "authentic" Corsican by "natives" who cannot speak the language well.

Bucholtz (2001) and Kiesling (2001) use the concept of language ideology to explore peer relations and ethnic stereotypes among white

Americans. Bucholtz (2001) shows how many white high-school students adopt aspects of Black English Vernacular (BEV) and thereby mark themselves as "cool." She describes how "nerds" reject coolness and mark this rejection by refusing to adopt any features of BEV. Nerds even use what Bucholtz calls "superstandard" English, which includes careful attention to schooled articulation, grammar, and lexis even when most people speak less formally. Bucholtz describes ideologies that associate types of language use—using superstandard, borrowing a few features of BEV, speaking mostly BEV—with types of people—nerds who reject coolness, white students trying to be cool, and white students who go too far toward a racialized other. Kiesling (2001) describes the speech of white middle-class fraternity brothers, exploring how racially linked features of their speech serve interactional functions and reproduce social hierarchies. He shows how fraternity members assert intellectual or economic superiority over each other by marking interlocutors as metaphorically "black." He also shows how they assert physical prowess over each other by speaking like black men themselves and inhabiting a stereotype of physical masculinity. As they jockey for position in everyday life, the fraternity brothers use and reinforce ideologies of BEV speakers as less rational, economically distressed, and physically imposing.

Stocker (2003), Bokhorst-Heng (1999), and Berkley (2001) apply the concept of language ideology to educational situations outside of Europe and North America. Stocker (2003) describes a monolingual Spanish-speaking group in Costa Rica that is believed to speak a stigmatized dialect—despite the fact that their speech is not linguistically distinguishable from their neighbors'—because they live on an artificially bounded "reservation" and are perceived as "indigenous." She shows how high-school language instruction reinforces this ideology. Bokhorst-Heng (1999; see also Wee 2006) describes how Singapore used schools to make Mandarin the mother tongue of ethnically Chinese Singaporeans. In 1957, less than 0.1% of ethnically Chinese Singaporeans

spoke Mandarin as their home dialect, but in the 1970s the government selected Malay, Tamil, and Mandarin as the mother tongues of all Singaporeans. The government created an image of Singapore as a multicultural state composed of three homogeneous subgroups and tied this image to the three home languages that students were to use in school. Berkely (2001) describes adult Mayan speakers at school learning to write authentic local stories in their language. He shows how this brought two ideologies into conflict: an ideology of literacy as cognitive skill that emphasized the authority of the young female teacher, and a traditional ideology that presented older men as empowered to tell stories on behalf of others. Berkely shows how the teacher and elders creatively navigated this conflict, with older men telling stories that younger people learned to write down.

Some linguistic anthropologists of education use the concept of language ideology to study broader power relations. Insofar as this work loses touch with the total linguistic fact—most often by failing to attend to the work of producing social relations through flexible language use in and across events—it does not maintain a linguistic anthropological approach. But Blommaert (2005) argues that linguistic anthropological work can both analyze language use in practice and explore enduring power relations that are themselves created partly through language. He focuses on "structural inequalities within the world system" (p. 57) that are both constituted by and yield differential abilities to have voice in educational and other institutional settings. Related linguistic anthropological work describes various ways in which educational institutions establish or reinforce power relations (Harris & Rampton 2003, Macbeth 2003, Varenne & McDermott 1998, Wortham 1992).

Heller (1999) and Blommaert (1999) describe language planning and education within multilingual nation states. They analyze how state and institutional language policies differentially position diverse populations. Heller (1999) studies how French Canadians' arguments for ethnic and linguistic legitimacy have

shifted over the past few decades. Before globalization, French Canadians proclaimed the authenticity of their culture and asserted their rights as a minority group in Canada. In recent years, however, they emphasize the benefit of French as an international language. This shift in models of "Frenchness" has changed the value of various French Canadians, with bilinguals now valued more than monolinguals and Standard French valued more than vernaculars. Heller explores how a French-language high-school in Anglophone Ontario handles the resulting tensions between standard and vernacular French and between French and English. Blommaert (1999) describes how the Tanzanian state has used language planning for nation building, trying to make a common nation out of a multilingual society by establishing Swahili as the primary language of government and education. In the process, language planners both deliberately and inadvertently created "symbolic hierarchies," making some types of speakers sound more authoritative.

Other linguistic anthropological work on education and power has addressed literacy (Barton & Hamilton 1998, Blommaert et al. 2006, Bloome et al. 2004, Collins & Blot 2003, Hicks 1996, Kamberelis & Scott 2004, Street 1984). Street (1984) distinguishes between a theory of literacy as "autonomous"—which casts it as a cognitive skill independent of cultural contexts—and theories that emphasize the diverse cultural contexts and activities in which writing is used. He shows how governments and educational institutions favor the autonomous view and how this disadvantages "less literate" peoples and students with non-mainstream literacy practices. Collins & Blot (2003) follow Street in exploring literacy and power, but they also describe how local practices are embedded in global processes such as colonialism and neo-liberalism. They analyze interdependencies between local uses of literacy and larger sociohistorical movements, describing the hegemony of the literate standard and how this has provided cultural capital to some groups while disadvantaging others. They argue against the common assumption

that schooled literacy always provides intellectual and economic salvation for the "less developed," and they show how this assumption devalues nonstandard literacies and has been used to justify exploitation.

Many other linguistic anthropologists have explored how educational institutions create social relations as they employ and transform language ideologies (McGroarty 2008, Wortham & Berkley 2001), showing how schools differentially value students from certain groups (Lemke 2002, Warriner 2004), how schools maintain authorized accounts of appropriate and inappropriate speech (Jackson 2008), how governments use school systems to establish visions of national language and identity (Hult 2005), how academic ideologies shape language revitalization efforts (Collins 1998), and how individuals draw on schooled language ideologies to identify others and value them differentially (Baquedano-López 1997). Linguistic anthropological work on educational language ideologies thus helps describe the important role schools play in producing differentially valued social groups.

DOMAIN

Work on language ideology shows how language in use both shapes and is shaped by more enduring social relations. We must not, however, cast this as a simple two-part process—sometimes called the "micro-macro dialectic"—in which events create structures and structures are created in events (Bourdieu 1972, Holland & Lave 2001, Wortham 2006). Agha (2007, Agha & Wortham 2005) provides a useful alternative conceptualization. He argues that all language ideologies, all models that link linguistic features with typifications of people and events, have a domain. They are recognized only by a subset of any linguistic community, and this subset changes as signs and models move across space and time. There is no one "macro" set of models or ideologies universal to a group. Instead, there are models that move across domains ranging from pairs, to local groups, all the way up to global

language communities. In analyzing language and social life, we must describe various relevant resources—models drawn from different spatial and temporal scales—that facilitate a phenomenon of interest, and we must describe how models move across events (Agha 2007; Agha & Wortham 2005; Wortham 2005, 2006). Instead of focusing only on speech events, or simply connecting microlevel events to macrolevel structures, we must investigate the many scales of social organization relevant to understanding language in use. We must also, as Agha (2007), Leander & McKim (2003), and Wortham (2005, 2006) argue, follow the chains or trajectories across which individuals, signs, and ideologies move.

In their study of "untracking" as an educational reform, Mehan et al. (1996) go beyond a simple combination of local events and "macro" patterns. They explore various realms that influence at-risk students' school success—ranging from properties of the student him- or herself to parents, family, the classroom, the school, peer groups, the local community, as well as to national educational policy and broader socioeconomic constraints. Instead of describing micro and macro, Mehan and his colleagues describe how resources from many spatial and temporal scales facilitate or impede students' academic success. They give a more complex account of how intelligence, educational success, and other aspects of identity are constructed in practice, describing how resources from various layers of social context together facilitate a student's path. Similarly, Barton & Hamilton (2005) and Barton & Tusting (2005) attend to various "middle" scales that exist between micro and macro, exploring the multiple, changing groups relevant to language and social identities and following the trajectories that individuals and texts take across contexts.

Wortham (2006) describes months-long trajectories across which students' identities emerge in one ninth-grade urban classroom. He traces the development of local models for several types of student one might be in this classroom, showing the distinctive gendered

models that emerge. These local models both draw on and transform more widely circulating models, and they are used in sometimes-unexpected ways in particular classroom events. The analysis follows two students across the academic year, showing how their identities emerge as speakers transform widely circulating models of race and gender into local models of appropriate and inappropriate studenthood and as teachers and students contest these identities in particular interactions. Bartlett (2007) follows one immigrant student's trajectory across several classroom contexts and over many months, exploring how she positions herself with respect to local models of school success. Bartlett describes how the student's local identity stabilized as she kept herself from being acquired by the deficit model often applied to language minority students and instead became "successful" in the school's terms. Rogers (2003) also follows an individual student's trajectory across two years as the student and her family negotiate with authorities about whether she is "disabled." Rogers shows how both institutionalized and local models and practices facilitate the transformation of this student from "low achieving" to "disabled," and she follows the links among official texts, conferences, tests, family conversations, and other events that helped constitute this student's movement toward disability.

Systematic work on what Agha (2007) calls domain, and on the trajectories across which signs and ideologies move, has emerged only recently. In contrast, research on form, use, and ideology—aspects of the total linguistic fact that allow us to treat the speech event as the focal unit of analysis—has been occurring for decades. It has become clear, however, that we cannot fully understand how language constitutes social relations unless we move beyond the lone speech event and attend to domains and trajectories. Even the most sophisticated analyses of linguistic forms, in use, with respect to ideologies, fail to capture how ways of speaking, models of language and social life, and individual identities emerge across events. New linguistic anthropological work on

domains and trajectories in educational institutions will show how schools play important roles in the emergence of social relations across various timescales.

CONCLUSIONS

Linguistic anthropologists study linguistic forms, in use, as construed by ideologies, as those forms and language ideologies move across speech events. Linguistic anthropological research on education illuminates educational processes and shows how language and education contribute to processes of broad anthropological concern. Educational language use produces social groups, sanctions official identities, differentially values those groups and identities, and sometimes creates hybrid identities and unexpected social types. Linguistic anthropological accounts of how these processes occur can enrich both educational and anthropological research.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The author is not aware of any biases that might be perceived as affecting the objectivity of this review.

LITERATURE CITED

Agha A. 2007. *Language and Social Relations*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press

Agha A, Wortham S. 2005. Discourse across speech-events: intertextuality and interdiscursivity in social life. *J. Linguist. Anthropol.* 15(1):Spec. Issue

Alim H. 2004. *You Know My Steez: An Ethnographic and Sociolinguistic Study of Styleshifting in a Black American Speech Community*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Baquedano-López P. 1997. Creating social identities through *Doctrina* narratives. *Issues Appl. Linguist.* 8:27–45

Bartlett L. 2007. Bilingual literacies, social identification, and educational trajectories. *Linguist. Educ.* 18:215–31

Barton D, Hamilton M. 1998. *Local Literacies*. New York: Routledge

Barton D, Hamilton M. 2005. Literacy, reification and the dynamics of social interaction. See Barton & Tusting 2005, pp. 14–35

Barton D, Tusting K, ed. 2005. *Beyond Communities of Practice*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press

Bauman R, Briggs C. 1990. Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 19:59–88

Bazerman C. 1999. *The Languages of Edison's Light*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Berkley A. 2001. Respecting Maya language revitalization. *Linguist. Educ.* 12:345–66

Blommaert J. 1999. *State Ideology and Language in Tanzania*. Germany: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag

Blommaert J. 2005. *Discourse*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press

Blommaert J, Creve L, Willaert E. 2006. On being declared illiterate: language-ideological disqualification in Dutch classes for immigrants in Belgium. *Lang. Commun.* 26:34–54

Bloome D, Carter S, Christian B, Otto S, Shuart-Faris N. 2004. *Discourse Analysis and the Study of Classroom Language and Literacy Events*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

Boas F. 1911. *Handbook of American Indian Languages*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Inst. Press

Bokhorst-Heng W. 1999. Singapore's "Speak Mandarin Campaign." In *Language Ideological Debates*, ed. J Blommaert, pp. 235–66. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter

Bourdieu P. 1972/1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Transl. R. Nice. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press

Bucholtz M. 2001. The whiteness of nerds: superstandard English and racial markedness. *J. Linguist. Anthropol.* 11:84–100

Cazden C, John V, Hymes D, ed. 1972. *Functions of Language in the Classroom*. New York: Teachers Coll. Press

Collins J. 1996. Socialization to text. See Silverstein & Urban 1996, pp. 203–28

Collins J. 1998. *Understanding Tolowa Histories: Western Hegemonies and Native American Responses*. New York: Routledge

Collins J, Blot R. 2003. *Literacy and Literacies*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press

Cook-Gumperz J, ed. 1986. *The Social Construction of Literacy*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press

Duff P. 2002. The discursive coconstruction of knowledge, identity and difference: an ethnography of communication in the high school mainstream. *Appl. Linguist.* 23:289–322

Duff P. 2003. Intertextuality and hybrid discourses: the infusion of pop culture in educational discourse. *Linguist. Educ.* 14:231–76

Duff P, Hornberger N, ed. 2007. *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Vol. 8: *Language Socialization*. New York: Springer. 2nd rev.

Duranti A. 1997. *Linguistic Anthropology*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press

Eckert P. 2000. *Linguistic Variation as Social Practice: The Linguistic Construction of Identity in Belten High*. Malden, MA: Blackwell

Erickson F. 2004. *Talk and Social Theory: Ecologies of Speaking and Listening in Everyday Life*. Malden, MA: Polity

Erickson F, Schultz J. 1982. *Counselor as Gatekeeper: Social Interaction in Interviews*. New York: Academic

Garrett P, Baquedano-López P. 2002. Language socialization: reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 31:339–61

Goffman E. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press

González N, Arnot-Hopffer E. 2003. Voices of the children: language and literacy ideologies in a dual language immersion program. See Wortham & Rymes 2003, pp. 213–43

Gumperz J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press

Gumperz J. 1986. Interactional sociolinguistics in the study of schooling. In *The Social Construction of Literacy*, ed. J Cook-Gumperz. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press

Gumperz J, Hymes D, ed. 1964. The ethnography of communication. *Am. Anthropol.* 66(No. 6, Pt. 2):Spec. Issue

Hall K. 1999. Understanding educational processes in an era of globalization: the view from anthropology and cultural studies. In *Issues in Educational Research*, ed. E Lagemann, L Shulman, pp. 121–56. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Halliday M. 2004. *The Language of Science*. New York: Continuum

Hanks W. 1996. *Language and Communicative Practices*. Boulder, CO: Westview

Harris R, Rampton B. 2003. Introduction. In *The Language, Ethnicity and Race Reader*, eds. R Harris, B Rampton, pp. 1–14. New York: Routledge

He A. 2003. Linguistic anthropology and language education. See Wortham & Rymes 2003, pp. 93–119

Heath S. 1983. *Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press

Heath S, McLaughlin M. 1993. *Identity and Inner-City Youth: Beyond Ethnicity and Gender*. New York: Teachers Coll. Press

Heller M. 1999. *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity*. Paramus, NJ: Prentice Hall

Hicks D. 1996. *Discourse, Learning and Schooling*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press

Hill J, Irvine J, ed. 1993. *Responsibility and Evidence in Oral Discourse*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press

Holland D, Lave J, ed. 2001. *History in Person: Enduring Struggles, Contentious Practice, Intimate Identities*. Santa Fe, NM: Sch. Am. Res. Press

Hornberger N. 2002. Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: an ecological approach. *Lang. Policy* 1:27–51

Hornberger N, Hult F. 2006. Educational linguistics. In *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, ed. K Brown, pp. 76–81. Oxford, UK: Elsevier

Howard K. 2007. Language socialization and language shift among school-aged children. In *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Vol. 8: *Language Socialization*, ed. P Duff, N Hornberger, pp. 187–99. New York: Springer

Hull G, Schultz K. 2002. *School's Out! Bridging Out of School Literacies with Classroom Practice*. New York: Teachers Coll. Press

Hult F. 2005. A case of prestige and status planning: Swedish and English in Sweden. *Curr. Issues Lang. Plan.* 6:73–79

Hymes D. 1964. Introduction: toward ethnographies of communication. *Am. Anthropol.* 66(No. 6, Pt. 2):1–34

Hymes D. 1972. Introduction. See Cazden et al. 1972, pp. xi–lvii

Jackson K. 2008. The social construction of youth and mathematics: the case of a fifth grade classroom. In *Mathematics Teaching, Learning, and Liberation in African American Contexts*, ed. D Martin. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

Jaffe A. 1999. *Ideologies in Action: Language Politics on Corsica*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter

Jakobson R. 1960. Closing statement: linguistics and poetics. In *Style in Language*, ed. T Sebeok, pp. 350–77. Cambridge, MA: MIT

Kamberelis G. 2001. Producing heteroglossic classroom (micro)cultures through hybrid discourse practice. *Linguist. Educ.* 12:85–125

Kamberelis G, Scott K. 2004. Other people's voices. In *Uses of Intertextuality in Classroom and Educational Research*, ed. N Shuart-Faris, D Bloome, pp. 201–50. Charlotte: Inf. Age

Kiesling S. 2001. Stances of whiteness and hegemony in fraternity men's discourse. *J. Linguist. Anthropol.* 11:101–15

Kumpulainen K, Mutanen M. 1999. The situated dynamics of peer group interaction: an introduction to an analytic framework. *Learn. Instr.* 9:449–73

Labov W. 1972. *Language in the Inner City*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press

Labov W, Ash S, Boberg C. 2006. *The Atlas of North American English: Phonetics, Phonology, and Sound*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter

Leander K. 2002. Locating Latanya. *Res. Teach. Engl.* 37:198–250

Leander K, McKim K. 2003. Tracing the everyday "sitings" of adolescents on the internet: a strategic adaptation of ethnography across online and offline spaces. *Educ. Comm. Inf.* 3:211–40

Lemke J. 2002. Ideology, intertextuality, and the communication of science. In *Relations and Functions in Language and Discourse*, ed. P Fries, M Cummings, D Lockwood, W Spruiell, pp. 32–55. London: Cassell

Lempert M. 2006. Disciplinary theatrics: public reprimand and the textual performance of affect at Sera Monastery, India. *Lang. Comm.* 26:15–33

Lempert M. 2007. Conspicuously past: distressed discourse and diagrammatic embedding in a Tibetan represented speech style. *Lang. Comm.* 27:258–71

Levinson B. 1999. Resituating the place of educational discourse in anthropology. *Am. Anthropol.* 101:594–604

Levinson S. 1983. *Pragmatics*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press

Lo A. 2004. Evidentiality and morality in a Korean heritage language school. *Pragmatics* 14:235–56

Lucy J, ed. 1993. *Reflexive Language*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press

Macbeth D. 2003. Hugh Mehan's *Learning Lessons* reconsidered: on the differences between the naturalistic and critical analysis of classroom discourse. *Am. Educ. Res. J.* 40:239–80

Magga O, Skutnabb-Kangas T. 2003. Life or death for languages and human beings: experiences from Saamiland. In *Transcending Monolingualism: Linguistic Revitalisation in Education*, ed. L Huss, A Grima, K King, pp. 35–52. Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger

McDermott R, Varenne H. 1995. Culture *as* disability. *Anthropol. Educ. Q.* 26:324–48

McGroarty M. 2008. The political matrix of linguistic ideologies. In *Handbook of Educational Linguistics*, ed. B Spolsky, F Hult, pp. 98–112. Oxford: Blackwell

Mehan H, Villanueva I, Hubbard L, Lintz A. 1996. *Constructing School Success: The Consequences of Untracking Low Achieving Students*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press

Mendoza-Denton N. 2007. *Homegirls: Language and Cultural Practice among Latina Youth Gangs*. New York: Wiley

Mertz E. 1996. Recontextualization as socialization: text and pragmatics in the law school classroom. See Silverstein & Urban 1996, pp. 229–49

Mertz E. 2007. Semiotic anthropology. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 36:337–53

Mertz E, Parmentier R, eds. 1985. *Semiotic Mediation*. New York: Academic

Moore L. 1999. Language socialization research and French language education in Africa: a Cameroonian case study. *Can. Mod. Lang. Rev.* 56:329–50

Ochs E, Schieffelin B. 2007. Language socialization: an historical overview. In *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Vol. 8: *Language Socialization*, ed. P Duff, N Hornberger, pp. 1–13. Dordrecht: Kluwer Acad.

O'Connor K. 2001. Contextualization and the negotiation of social identities in a geographically distributed situated learning project. *Linguist. Educ.* 12:285–308

Parmentier R. 1997. The pragmatic semiotics of cultures. *Semiotica* 116:1–115

Peirce C. 1955. *Philosophical writings of Peirce*, ed. J Buchler. New York: Dover

Pelissier C. 1991. The anthropology of teaching and learning. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 20:75–95

Putnam H. 1975. The meaning of "meaning." In *Language, Mind and Knowledge*, ed. K Gunderson. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press

Rampton B. 2005. *Crossing*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome. 2nd ed.

Rampton B. 2006. *Language in Late Modernity: Interaction in an Urban School*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press

Rampton B. 2007. Neo-Hymesian linguistic ethnography in the United Kingdom. *J. Sociolinguist.* 11:584–607

Rex L, Green J. 2008. Classroom discourse and interaction: reading across the traditions. In *Handbook of Educational Linguistics*, ed. B Spolsky, F Hult, pp. 571–84. Oxford: Blackwell

Reyes A. 2002. "Are you losing your culture?": poetics, indexicality and Asian American identity. *Discourse Stud.* 4:183–99

Reyes A. 2005. Appropriation of African American slang by Asian American youth. *J. Sociolinguist.* 9:509–32

Riley K. 2008. Language socialization. In *Handbook of Educational Linguistics*, ed. B Spolsky, F Hult, pp. 398–410. Oxford: Blackwell

Rogers R. 2003. *A Critical Discourse Analysis of Family Literacy Practices: Power In and Out of Print*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

Rymes B. 2001. *Conversational Borderlands: Language and Identity in an Alternative Urban High School*. New York: Teachers Coll. Press

Rymes B. 2003. Relating word to world: indexicality during literacy events. See Wortham & Rymes 2003, pp. 121–50

Rymes B. 2007. Language socialization and the linguistic anthropology of education. In *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Vol. 8: *Language Socialization*, ed. P Duff, N Hornberger, pp. 29–42. New York: Springer. 2nd ed.

Sapir E. 1921. *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York: Harcourt Brace

Sawyer K. 2004. Improvised lessons: collaborative discussion in the constructivist classroom. *Teach. Educ.* 15:189–201

Schieffelin B, Ochs E, ed. 1986. *Language Socialization across Cultures*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press

Schieffelin B, Woolard K, Kroskrity P, ed. 1998. *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press

Silverstein M. 1976. Shifters, linguistic categories, and cultural description. In *Meaning in Anthropology*, ed. K Basso, H Selby, pp. 11–55. Albuquerque: Univ. N. M. Press

Silverstein M. 1979. Language structure and linguistic ideology. In *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels*, ed. P Clyne, W Hanks, C Hofbauer, pp. 193–247. Chicago: Chicago Ling. Soc.

Silverstein M. 1985. Language and the culture of gender: at the intersection of structure, usage and ideology. See Mertz & Parmentier 1985, pp. 219–59

Silverstein M. 1992. The indeterminacy of contextualization: When is enough enough? In *The Contextualization of Language*, ed. A DiLuzio, P Auer, pp. 55–75. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Silverstein M. 2003. Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Lang. Comm.* 23:193–229

Silverstein M, Urban G, eds. 1996. *Natural Histories of Discourse*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Spolsky B, Hult F, ed. 2008. *Handbook of Educational Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell

Stocker K. 2003. "Ellos se comen las eses/heces." See Wortham & Rymes 2003, pp. 185–211

Street B. 1984. *Literacy in Theory and Practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press

Urban G. 1996. *Metaphysical Community*. Austin: Univ. Tex. Press

Urban G. 2001. *Metaculture: How Culture Moves through the World*. Minneapolis, MN: Univ. Minn. Press

Varenne H. 2007. Difficult collective deliberations: anthropological notes toward a theory of education. *Teach. Coll. Rec.* 109:1559–88

Varenne H, McDermott R. 1998. *Successful Failure: The School America Builds*. Boulder, CO: Westview

Viechnicki G. 2008. "The evidence from your experiment is a weight loss": grammatical processes of objectification in a middle school science classroom. *Linguist. Educ.* 19:In press

Viechnicki G, Kuipers J. 2006. "It's all human error!": when a school science experiment fails. *Linguist. Educ.* 17:107–30

Warriner D. 2004. "The days now is very hard for my family": the negotiation and construction of gendered work identities among newly arrived women refugees. *J. Lang. Identity Educ.* 3:279–94

Warriner D. 2007. Transnational literacies: immigration, language learning, and identity. *Linguist. Educ.* 18:201–14

Wee L. 2006. The semiotics of language ideologies in Singapore. *J. Sociolinguist.* 10:344–61

Whorf B. 1956. *Language, Thought and Reality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Wortham S. 1992. Participant examples and classroom interaction. *Linguist. Educ.* 4:195–217

Wortham S. 2003. Accomplishing identity in participant-denoting discourse. *J. Linguist. Anthropol.* 13:1–22

Wortham S. 2005. Socialization beyond the speech event. *J. Linguist. Anthropol.* 15:95–112

Wortham S. 2006. *Learning Identity: The Mediation of Social Identity through Academic Learning*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press

Wortham S, Berkley A, eds. 2001. *Language ideology and education*. *Linguist. Educ.* 12(3):Spec. issue

Wortham S, Jackson K. 2008. Educational constructionisms. In *Handbook of Constructionist Research*, ed. J Holstein, J Gubrium, pp. 107–27. New York: Guilford

Wortham S, Rymes B, eds. 2003. *Linguistic Anthropology of Education*. Westport, CT: Praeger

Zentella A. 1997. *Growing Up Bilingual: Puerto Rican Children in New York*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell